

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 19 2006

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed April 19, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 9, 15, and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite. The claims have been amended to provide further clarification and are believed to overcome the rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-14, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Munson* (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,262). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the *Munson* reference. Applicants discuss the *Munson* reference and Applicants' claims in the following.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A method comprising: *receiving a user selection of one or more print options via a network service, wherein the one or more print options are identified for subsequent resolution, and wherein the one or more print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing a document.*

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of "receiving a user selection of one or more print options via a network service, wherein the one or more print options are identified for subsequent resolution, and wherein the one or more print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Munson* discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

As such, *Munson* fails to teach or suggest the "print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added). Rather, *Munson* describes a process for configuring a user interface. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Munson*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

BEST AVAILABLE COPYSerial No.: 09/905,506
Art Unit: 2626b. Claims 3-4

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 3-4 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 3-4 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 3-4 should be withdrawn.

Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 3-4, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

c. Claim 5

As provided in independent claim 5, Applicants claim:

One or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

communicating a plurality of possible print options to a client computer;

receiving a user indication of selected ones of the plurality of possible print

options;

receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print

options;

saving the selected print options with the associated identifier;

and

making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 5 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the features of making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the

BEST AVAILABLE COPYSerial No.: 09/905,506
Art Unit: 2626

one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited and emphasized above in claim 5.

Rather, *Munson* discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

As such, *Munson* fails to teach or suggest "making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited in the claim. (Emphasis added). Rather, *Munson* describes a process for configuring a user interface. Therefore, claim 5 is not anticipated by *Munson*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

d. Claim 7-8

Because independent claim 5 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 7-8 (which depend from independent claim 5) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 7-8 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 5. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 6-8 should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 7-8, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record.

e. Claim 9

As provided in independent claim 9, Applicants claim:

A graphical user interface comprising:
a plurality of portions illustrating user-selectable print options
and graphical
mechanisms via which a user can select the print options;
an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can
input an identifier of the selected print options; and
another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a
desire to save the selected print options as associated with the
identifier and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers, *the
print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner
for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print
options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the
plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in
printing a document.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited and emphasized above in claim 9.

Rather, *Munson* discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

As such, *Munson* fails to teach or suggest "the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document," as recited in the claim. Rather, *Munson* describes a process for configuring a user interface. Therefore, claim 9 is not anticipated by *Munson*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

f. Claims 10-14

Because independent claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 10-14 (which depend from independent claim 9) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 10-14 contain all the features of independent claim 9. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 10-14 should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 10-14, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

g. Claim 22

As provided in independent claim 22, Applicants claim:

A method, implemented in a print service coupled to a network, the method comprising:

receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired print options, wherein the set of desired print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired print options;

checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired print options; and

for each option in the set of desired print options,

BEST AVAILABLE COPYSerial No.: 09/905,506
Art Unit: 2626

applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired print options, wherein the set of desired print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired print options," "applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option," as recited and emphasized above in claim 22.

Rather, *Munson* discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

As such, *Munson* fails to teach or suggest "receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired print options, wherein the set of desired print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired print options," "applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the print option," as recited

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

in the claim. Rather, Munson describes a process for configuring a user interface that does not involve a set of desired print options identified in a print request. Therefore, claim 22 is not anticipated by *Munson*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Munson* in view of *Yanagidaira* (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,052). Claims 6 and 15-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Munson* in view of *Small* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0172589). Claim 23 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Munson* in view of *Davis* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059489). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

a. Claims 2 and 6

With regard to claim 2, claim 2 is allowable is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that claim 2 contains all the features on independent claim 1 and *Yanagidaira* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Munson* reference.

With regard to claim 6, claim 6 is allowable is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that claim 6 contains all the features on independent claim 5 and *Small* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Munson* reference.

b. Claim 15

As provided in independent claim 15, Applicants claim:

One or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed, the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document;

receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed; and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

communicating the indicated set of print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the print options identified in the set of print options.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* in view of *Small* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed, the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document," as recited and emphasized above in claim 15.

With regard to *Munson*, it discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

Likewise, *Small* discloses:

One or more embodiments of the invention provide for selecting and associating multiple output devices with one or more files, layouts, or views. A user selects a file, layout, or view. A dialog is displayed to the user enabling the user to select the output device such as a plotter or printer, and to configure the output device and page setup options to the user's specifications. Alternatively, the user selects/creates an output device configuration (referred to as a virtual configuration) regardless of whether an actual output device with the configuration exists or has been installed. The selected device(s) and settings are

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

then associated with the file, layout, or view by storing some settings with the file, layout, or view and storing other settings with the output device reference (e.g., with the plotter driver or PC3 file (discussed below)).

Para. 0033 (Emphasis added).

One or more embodiments of the invention enable a user to specify and configure a different output device (or output device configuration) for one or more files, layouts, or views. The specified output device and its configuration is then associated with the file, layout, or view. By associating the output device and its configuration with the file, layout, or view, a user does not need to reconfigure or re-specify the output device when another file, layout, or view specifies a different output device or when the default output device for the application is different.

Para. 0039.

As such, *Munson* and *Small* individually or in combination fails to teach or suggest "receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed, the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document," as recited in the claim. Rather, each describe processes for configuring user interfaces and layouts that do not involve a set of desired print options identified in a print request. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the proposed combination of *Munson* in view of *Small*.

c. Claims 16-18

Because independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 16-18 (which depend from independent claim 15) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 16-18 contain all the features of independent claim 15. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 16-18 should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 16-18, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

d. Claim 19

As provided in independent claim 19, Applicants claim:

A system comprising:

a network interface configured to allow the system to communicate with one or more other systems via a network; and

a printer configuration user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface, wherein the printer configuration user interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name, and wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to, *the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 19 is allowable for at least the reason that *Munson* in view of *Small* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document," as recited and emphasized above in claim 19.

With regard to *Munson*, it discloses at most a "method and graphical user interface for displaying and configuring color management settings for printing devices in networked computing environments. . . . As the user modifies the color management settings, the interface mapping is updated to show available options and current output paths in real time, according to the modifications. . . . In a network environment providing bi-directional communication between workstation and peripherals, the color management tool queries the printing device and builds the user interface according to the unique capabilities and attributes of the printing device." Col. 2, lines 10-37 (Emphasis added).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

"In this way, the user interface is still able to provide options specific to a particular printing device. For example, if a printing device 'A' offers RGB Separation and a second printing device 'B' does not; when connecting to device 'A,' the interface displays RGB Separation, but when connecting to device 'B,' RGB Separation is not displayed." Col. 3, lines 20-52

Likewise, *Small* discloses:

One or more embodiments of the invention provide for selecting and associating multiple output devices with one or more files, layouts, or views. A user selects a file, layout, or view. A dialog is displayed to the user enabling the user to select the output device such as a plotter or printer, and to configure the output device and page setup options to the user's specifications. Alternatively, the user selects/creates an output device configuration (referred to as a virtual configuration) regardless of whether an actual output device with the configuration exists or has been installed. The selected device(s) and settings are then associated with the file, layout, or view by storing some settings with the file, layout, or view and storing other settings with the output device reference (e.g., with the plotter driver or PC3 file (discussed below)).

Para. 0033 (Emphasis added).

One or more embodiments of the invention enable a user to specify and configure a different output device (or output device configuration) for one or more files, layouts, or views. The specified output device and its configuration is then associated with the file, layout, or view. By associating the output device and its configuration with the file, layout, or view, a user does not need to reconfigure or re-specify the output device when another file, layout, or view specifies a different output device or when the default output device for the application is different.

Para. 0039.

As such, *Munson* and *Small* individually or in combination fails to teach or suggest "the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document," as recited in the claim. Rather, each describe processes for configuring a user interfaces and layouts that do not involve a set of desired print options identified in a print request. Therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established by the proposed combination of *Munson* in view of *Small*.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 09/905,506

Art Unit: 2626

e. Claims 20-21

Because independent claim 19 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 20-21 (which depend from independent claim 19) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 20-21 contain all the features of independent claim 19. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 20-21 should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 20-21, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 23-25

Because independent claim 22 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 23-25 (which depend from independent claim 22) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 23-25 contain all the features of independent claim 22 and *Davis* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Munson* reference. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 23-25 should be withdrawn. Additionally and notwithstanding the foregoing reasons for allowability of claims 23-25, these claims recite further features and/or combinations of features (as is apparent by examination of the claims themselves) that are patentably distinct from the cited art of record. Accordingly, the rejections to these claims should be withdrawn.

BEST AVAILABLE COPYSerial No.: 09/905,506
Art Unit: 2626**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283